

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	CRIMINAL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	NO. 98-131-3
RONALD CHAMPNEY	:	

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 13th day of February, 2024, upon consideration of Defendant Ronald Champney's Amended Motion to Reduce Sentence Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) ("Motion for Compassionate Release," ECF No. 304), *Pro Se* Motion for Sentence Reduction Under 18 U.S.C. Section 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) ("*Pro Se* Motion," ECF No. 285), Motion for Relief from His 18 U.S.C. 924(c) Conviction and Sentence (Firearms Enhancement) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 ("Habeas Motion," ECF No. 301), Motion to Correct Error and/or Omission in Judgment Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 36 ("Rule 36 Motion," ECF No. 308), Defendant's Letter Request Regarding First Step Act Time Credits ("Letter Request," ECF No. 300), and all documents submitted in support thereof and in opposition thereto, it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant's Motion for Compassionate Release is **DENIED**.
2. Defendant's Pro Se Motion is **DISMISSED** as moot.
3. Defendant's Habeas Motion is **DENIED**.
4. Defendant's Rule 36 Motion is **DENIED**.
5. Defendant's Letter Request is **DENIED** as the product of hybrid representation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant sent a letter to the Court requesting that we order the Bureau of Prisons to grant him First Step Act time credits that he allegedly qualifies for. However, he made this request *pro se* while being represented by counsel. The decision to permit hybrid representation—where a defendant acts as co-counsel to his attorney—is entirely within a district court's discretion. *United States v. Moro*, 505 F. App'x 113, 115 (3d Cir. 2012). Courts have no obligation to consider a defendant's *pro se* filings when the defendant is represented by counsel. See *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 465 U.S. 168, 183 (1984); *United*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ R. Barclay Surrick  
**R. BARCLAY SURRICK, J.**

---

*States v. D’Amario*, 256 F. App’x 569, 571 (3d Cir. 2007). This is because “[a] defendant does not have a constitutional right to choreograph special appearances by counsel.” *McKaskle*, 465 U.S. at 183. We will not permit Defendant to benefit from counsel’s representation while at the same time continuing to file pro se motions. His request is denied without prejudice.